

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,253	08/06/2001	Eun Seog Lee	MR2685-91	7861

7590 08/11/2004  
Rosenberg Klein & Lee  
Suite 101  
345 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043

EXAMINER

HAILU, TADESSE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/890,253

Applicant(s)

LEE, EUN SEOG

Examiner

Tadesse Hailu

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14-22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to the patent application number 09/890,253 filed on Feb 20, 2001.

### **Priority**

2. The patent application claims priority from foreign priority benefits under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), from application number (KR2000/4663U) filed February 21,2000.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the contents displayed" in line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because the closest limitation that "the contents displayed" referring to is "screen data for displaying a result" but there is no prior limitation in the claim referring to "the contents displayed"

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 14-22 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: This invention relates to a data processing system and controlling method using a dual monitor, on which separate contents are displayed respectively. Likewise, Singhal et al (5,488,385)

and Larson et al (6,297,817) relate to a computer system and method for running multiple display monitors.

With regard to claim 14-15, Singhal discloses a *dual monitor* (Fig. 2, #38, #40) for use in a computer system (Fig. 2, #30) having a VGA (Fig. 2, #34) outputting two video signals (Fig. 2, #42, #44) comprising: a first monitor (38) for receiving and displaying a first information data comprising main processing contents (primary or #1 display) of a program, which is presently being used by a user, output from a processor (Fig. 2, #12) of the computer system (30).

Furthermore while Singhal discloses all the computer hardware as recited in claim 14, but “ the second monitor formed integrally with the first monitor” is not disclosed instead as illustrated in Singhal, the first and second monitors are shown apart from each other (Fig. 2). Furthermore, since Singhal does not disclose or suggest that his system exchange or receive data from a network, Singhal also fails to disclose “a *second* information data and an ad data which are provided with the computer system through a network.”

With regard to claim 16-22, Singhal further fails to disclose “displaying results processed by a program used by a user on the first monitor and an information provided by a server on the *second* monitor, when the user connects to the network using the computer.”

Thus, prior art neither renders obvious nor anticipates the combination of claimed elements in light of the specification.

Art Unit: 2173

5. Claims 1-13 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

With regard to claim 1:

Larson discloses a data processing system (Fig. 1, #10) using *dual monitors* (Fig. 1, #16 and #20). Larson further discloses a memory for providing a data processing area using a program (computer system 10, Fig. 1, column 4, lines 47-62). Larson further discloses at least one or more input means (computer system 10, Fig. 1) for inputting data. Larson further discloses a first video graphics *adapter* (VGA) (Fig. 1, #14) for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs. Larson further discloses a *second* video graphics *adapter* (Fig. 1, #18) for generating and outputting screen data for displaying a result processed by at least one or more programs, the result being different from the contents displayed by the first VGA (column 6, lines 21-46). Larson further discloses a processor (Fig. 1, #12) for processing data input through the input means using the memory and outputting the processed result through the first and *second* VGAs. Larson further discloses a first monitor (Fig. 1, #16) for displaying screen data output from the first graphics *adapter*. *Larson further discloses a second monitor* (Fig. 1, #20) for displaying screen data output from the *second* graphics *adapter*. *Larson further discloses that the processor (12) alternatively displaying drawing program on either primary monitor 16 using the graphic*

Art Unit: 2173

adapter 14, or displaying the drawing program on non-primary monitor 20 using the graphic adapter 18 (column 12, lines 21-46).

While Larson discloses most of the claimed limitations, but Larson does not disclose "processes information, which is different from the contents displayed on the first monitor and input from the outside, and displays the information through the *second VGA and the second* monitor, and in case of selecting one of user interfaces displayed through the first or *second monitors*, displays the processed result on the other monitor."

#### Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (703) 306-2799. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 - 6:30 ET. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at (703) 308-3116 Art Unit 2173 CPK 2-4A51.

7. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Tadesse Hailu



August 2, 2004